A VIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN GREAT-BRITAIN AND HER COLONIES:

INCLUDING

A MODE of Determining their Preſent DISPUTES, Finally and Effectually;

AND OF PREVENTING

ALL FUTURE CONTENTIONS.

In a LETTER to the Author of A Full Vindication of the Meaſures of the Congreſs, from the Calumnies of their Enemies.

By *A. W.* FARMER,
Author of FREE THOUGHTS, &c.

——————how haſt thou inſtill'd
Thy *Malice* into *Thouſands*, once *upright*
And *faithful*; *now* prov'd *falſe*? MILTON.

NEW-YORK, Printed:
LONDON Reprinted for RICHARDSON and URQUHART, at the Royal Exchange. 1775.

A

VIEW

OF THE

CONTROVERSY, &c.

SIR,

YOU have done me the honour "to "beſtow ſome notice upon" a little pamphlet which I lately publiſhed, entitled, *Free Thoughts on the Proceedings of the Continental Congreſs*, in a Piece which you call, *A full Vindication of the Meaſures of the Congreſs, from the Calumnies of their Enemies*. My preſent buſineſs ſhall be to examine your Vindication, and ſee whether it *fully* exculpates *the meaſures of the Congreſs*, from the charges brought againſt them by the friends of order and good go-

vernment. This taſk I ſhall endeavour to perform, with all that freedom of thought and expreſſion, which, as an *Engliſhman* I have a right to; and which never ſhall be wreſted from me, either by *yourſelf* or the *Congreſs*.

I freely own, that I wrote and publiſhed the *Free Thoughts*, with a deſign to "diminiſh the influence, and prevent the effects "of the deciſions" of the Congreſs. You ſpeak of the *impotence* of ſuch attempts; of the general *indignation* with which they are treated; you ſay "that no material ill "conſequences (i. e. to your party) can "be dreaded from them." Why then did you take the pains to write ſo long, ſo elaborate a pamphlet, to juſtify deciſions againſt whoſe influence none but impotent attempts had been made?—to prevent ill conſequences which were not be dreaded? ——You felt, Sir, the force of the ſtubborn facts exhibited to the view of the public in the *Free Thoughts:* You perceived the ground on which the decrees of the Congreſs were founded, to be hollow and ready to fall in: you was willing to prop it up at any rate. You knew, that at the bar of

of *impartial* reaſon, and *common* ſenſe, the conduct of the Congreſs muſt be condemned. You was too much intereſted, too deeply engaged in party views and party heats, to bear this with patience. You had no remedy but *artifice*, *ſophiſtry*, *miſrepreſentation* and *abuſe*: Theſe are your weapons, and theſe you weild like an old experienced practitioner.

Is this *too* heavy a charge? Can you lay your hand upon your heart, and upon your honour plead *not guilty?*---Was it then vanity that led you to combat *ill conſequences that were not to be dreaded?* To prevent *impotent efforts* from ſucceeding, which, you knew, were not likely to ſucceed? to make *that* the object of general indignation, which already *was* ſo?---Was it purely to ſhine as a *patriotic writer?* To give a ſpecimen of your abilities?---To ſhew us, in ſhort, what you *can* do, that gave birth to the Vindication?---Probably, you had better have repreſſed theſe emotions: for though your pamphlet may pleaſe you party,---and I dare ſay, would have pleaſed them juſt as well with half its real merit,---though they may praiſe and extol it, as a matchleſs, in-

imitable performance; yet, Sir, in a literary way, good judges will conſider it only as the effort of a genius that never can riſe above mediocrity. If you ſeldom *ſink* into meanneſs of diction, you never *ſoar* into that *brilliancy* of thought; nor, even with the help of Johnſon's Dictionary, into that *claſſical elegance* of expreſſion which is abſolutely neceſſary for the arduous attempt of *ridiculing wit*.

I, who am a plain Farmer, though of ſome education, have no manner of inclination to diſpute the prize of *Wit* and *Ridicule*, with the panegyriſt of the late *all-accompliſhed* Congreſs. You, Sir, ſhall bear off the palm, unrivalled, unenvied by me.--- I, alſo, congratulate you on the diſcovery of "a ſeeming contradiction" in the Free Thoughts. I could point out to you a dozen more of its errors in diction and grammar; one of which you have quoted more than once, but you had too much generoſity of temper to animadvert upon it. I wrote the Free Thoughts, as I write now, without much regard to ſtile, or grammatical accuracy. My buſineſs was not to *pleaſe* or *amuſe*, but to *convince* my countrymen

men and fellow-ſubjects of the evil tendency of the meaſures of the Congreſs, and to give all the obſtruction in my power to their being carried into execution. This I did from a principle of conſcience, from a ſenſe of duty, from a love of *liberty*, of *order*, of *good* government, and of *America* my native country: Nor have my endeavours been without ſucceſs. The *Free Thoughts* have anſwered my utmoſt expectation: They have been rapidly purchaſed, and eagerly read; and notwithſtanding the *general indignation* of which you ſpeak, I have had the ſatisfaction of hearing them commended and approved by many, very many ſenſible people, in the city, as well as in the country: And I doubt not they will contribute, among other cauſes, to the reſtoration of that order and peace in this province, which is the earneſt wiſh of every *real* friend to America. I cannot but hope, that the time of this event is faſt approaching. I ſee the influence of the Congreſs daily diminiſhing. Few committees are choſen in the country to carry their *decrees* into execution. The committee of New-York has been obliged to recede from an *exact* compliance with their *edicts*, that even

even the appearance of a compliance might be preſerved: Why elſe do they permit the owners of goods imported, and which were ordered to be ſold for the benefit of the Boſton poor, to bid for their own goods, and have them ſtruck off at an under rate *? Why are they obliged to permit the very beſt regulation the Congreſs did make, to be continually infringed, by the importation of Tea, Gin, &c. from Holland. Theſe relaxations were neceſſary to cajole and take in the merchants, and therefore the committee complied: You thought it neceſſary to cajole and take in the Farmers, and therefore you wrote your pamphlet. But have a care, "ſweet Sir,"---pray was you in the nurſery where the whole converſation turned on *ſweeties* and *goodies*, when you luckily hit on this expreſſion? Or did you find it in Johnſon's Dictionary?---Have a care, I ſay, or we honeſt ſupporters of the laws and liberties of our country, ſhall finally get the better; reduce you and your party to peace and

* I hope the duty upon goods ſold at public auction, will be demanded on theſe ſales, becauſe that would bring ſomething into the provincial treaſury.

order,

order, and make you good ſubjects in ſpite of your teeth. I, for my part, ſhall exert my little influence to accompliſh ſo benevolent a purpoſe; and ſhall exerciſe my *pen* and hiccory *cudgel* in ſuch a manner, as I ſhall think moſt likely to effect it: And while I weild theſe weapons in defence of the laws of my country, and in ſuch a way as they permit and will warrant, I fear neither your *anſwers* nor your *threats*. The firſt committee-man that comes to rob me of my Tea, or my wine, or molaſſes, ſhall feel the weight of my arm; and ſhould you be the man, however lightly you may think of it, a ſtroke of my cudgel would make you reel, notwithſtanding the thickneſs of your ſkull.

You begin your vindication with ſuch an air of importance, and ſuch pompoſity of expreſſion, as I ſcarce ever met with before.——" It was hardly to be expected that " any man *could* be ſo *preſumptuous*, as " *openly* to controvert the *equity*, *wiſdom* and " *authority* of the meaſures adopted by the " Congreſs: an aſſembly truly reſpectable " on *every* account!—whether we conſider " the characters of the men, who com-

" poſed

" poſed it; the number and dignity of " their conſtituents, or the important ends " for which they were appointed."——Mere exploſions of the wind of vanity! Three grains of conſideration would have prevented ſuch a ſentence from ever ſeeing the light.

It has ever been eſteemed the privilege of Engliſhmen to canvaſs freely, the proceedings of every branch of the legiſlature; to examine into all public meaſures; to point out the errors that are committed in the adminiſtration of the government, and to cenſure without fear the conduct of all perſons in public ſtations, whoſe conduct ſhall appear to deſerve it. The exerciſe of this right has always been conſidered as one of the grand pillars which ſupport our preſent happy conſtitution. The liberty taken with the *King*, *Lords* and *Commons* in many late publications in England, muſt convince every man, that the Engliſh nation retains, unimpaired, this right of bringing the moſt reſpectable characters before the tribunal of the public: and is an inconteſtible proof that the nation is not enſlaved. Nor is this privilege exerciſed with

with leſs freedom in America than England. Did not the Congreſs? Do not you yourſelf? Does not every pidler in politics, who calls himſelf a *ſon of liberty*, take the licence of cenſuring and condemning the conduct of the *King*, the *Lords*, and the *Commons*, the ſupreme ſovereign authority of the whole Britiſh Empire? Bluſh then at your own effrontery, in endeavouring to intimidate your countrymen from exerciſing this Right with regard to the Congreſs.

The Congreſs, Sir, was founded in ſedition; its deciſions are ſupported by tyranny; and is it *preſumption* to controvert its *authority?* In your opinion, they "are *reſtleſs* "*ſpirits*,"---"enemies to the natural rights "of mankind"—who ſhall dare to ſpeak againſt the *Congreſs*, or attempt to "diminiſh "the influence of *their* deciſions:" while *they* are friends to America, and to the natural rights of mankind, who ſhall traduce and ſlander the ſovereign authority of the nation; contravene and trample under foot the laws of their country.

I have no inclination to ſcrutinize the characters of men, who compoſed the Con-

greſs. It is not the dignity of their private characters, but their public conduct as *Delegates* that comes under my examination. The manner in which they were choſen was ſubverſive of all law, and of the very conſtitution of the province. After they had met they were only a popular aſſembly, without check or controul, and therefore unqualified to make laws, or to paſs ordinances. Upon ſuppoſition that they had been choſen by all the people with one voice, they could be only the ſervants of the people; and every individual muſt have had a right to animadvert on their conduct, and to have cenſured it where he thought it wrong. *We* think, Sir, that we have a double right to do ſo, ſeeing they were choſen by a party only, and have endeavoured to tyrannize over the whole people.

You ſeem to think it very wrong that the Delegates ſhould be called to any account, becauſe " we did not, eſpecially " in this province, circumſcribe them by " any fixed boundary, and therefore as they " cannot be ſaid to have exceeded the limits " of their authority, their act muſt be " eſteemed

" eſteemed the act of their conſtituents." ---Above you had ſaid that " their decrees " are binding upon all, and demand a re- " ligious obſervance." A little below you make them their *own judges*, whether they have done right or not. And you repreſent it as no ſmall degree of *arrogance* and *ſelf-ſufficiency* for *any* individual to oppoſe his *private ſentiments* to their *united counſels*.

I have looked at this paragraph at leaſt ten times, and every time with aſtoniſhment. It is ſo ſuperlatively arrogant and impudent, that I confeſs myſelf at a loſs what to ſay to it. And here, leſt I ſhould grow angry and forget it, I muſt obſerve once for all, that I verily believe the New-York Delegates were ſome of the very beſt who attended the Congreſs. I have been informed that they, for a long time, oppoſed the violent meaſures that were in agitation. I honour them for this oppoſition; and ſhould almoſt have adored them, had they preſerved their integrity to the end.---But evil communications corrupt good manners. Let no honeſt man hereafter truſt himſelf at a Philadelphia Congreſs!

Not a hundredth part of the people of this province, Sir, had any vote in ſending the Delegates, and do you imagine that they would take the trouble to *circumſcribe* them, when they did not chuſe to have any thing to do with them? The *juntos* indeed who ſent them, acted the ſame fooliſh part in not *circumſcribing* them, that they did in chuſing them. But ſuppoſing all the people in the province had joined in ſending them *uncircumſcribed:* Were the Delegates at liberty to do as they pleaſed? To purſue the moſt violent meaſures? To ſtop up every avenue of accommodation with Great-Britain, and render our ſtate ten times worſe than they found it? Muſt all the province *religiouſly* obſerve their *wicked* decrees, and take all their *mad pranks* upon themſelves, whether they will or not? To be ſure they muſt: The Delegates were their *uncircumſcribed* repreſentatives.——I have heard often that the privileges of our repreſentatives, were the privileges of the people, but never till now that any abſurd meaſures they might adopt were chargeable to their conſtituents.

Do you think, Sir, that becauſe the Delegates were choſen by a *party*, that therefore they are accountable only to the *party* who choſe them? You deceive yourſelf if you do. Every day will produce more *Free Thoughts*, and *Canvaſſings*, and *Examinations*, till their influence is totally deſtroyed, and their tyranny at an end.

The epithet of *reſtleſs ſpirits* you muſt take back to yourſelf and your party. The next time you write, beſtow it where it is due;---on thoſe who have wantonly employed themſelves in fomenting diſturbances in the colony, in creating and widening the diſunion between the mother-country and us, in order to advance their favourite republican plan.

I wiſh you had explicitly declared to the public your ideas of the *natural rights of mankind*. Man in a *ſtate of nature* may be conſidered as perfectly free from all reſtraints of law and government: And then the *weak* muſt ſubmit to the *ſtrong*. From ſuch a ſtate, I confeſs, I have a violent averſion. I think the form of government we lately enjoyed a much more eligible ſtate

to

to live in: And cannot help regretting our having *loſt* it, by the *equity*, *wiſdom*, and *authority* of the Congreſs, who have introduced in the room of it, confuſion and violence; where all muſt ſubmit to the power of a mob.

You have taken ſome pains to prove what would readily have been granted you---that *liberty* is a very *good* thing, and *ſlavery* a very *bad* thing. But then I muſt think that liberty under a *King*, *Lords* and *Commons*, is as good as liberty under a republican Congreſs: And that ſlavery under a republican Congreſs is as bad, at leaſt, as ſlavery under a *King*, *Lords* and *Commons*: And upon the whole, that *liberty* under the ſupreme authority and protection of Great-Britain, is infinitely preferable to *ſlavery* under an American Congreſs. I will alſo agree with you, "that Americans are intitled to free-"dom." I will go further: I will own and acknowledge that not only *Americans*, but *Africans*, *Europeans*, *Aſiaticks*, all men, of all countries and degrees, of all ſizes and complexions, have a right to as much freedom as is conſiſtent with the ſecurity of civil ſociety: And I hope you will not think

think me an " enemy to the *natural* rights " of mankind" becauſe I cannot wiſh them more. We muſt however remember, that more liberty may, without inconvenience, be allowed to individuals in a ſmall government, than can be admitted of in a large empire.

But when you aſſert that " ſince Ameri- " cans have not by any act of theirs im- " powered the Britiſh parliament to make " laws for them, it follows they can have " no juſt authority to do it," you advance a poſition ſubverſive of that dependence which all colonies muſt, from their very nature, have on the mother-country.—By the Britiſh parliament, I ſuppoſe you mean the ſupreme legiſlative authority, the King, Lords and Commons, becauſe no other authority in England, has a right to make laws to bind the kingdom, and conſequently no authority to make laws to bind the colonies. In this ſenſe I ſhall underſtand, and uſe the phraſe *Britiſh parliament*.

Now the dependence of the colonies on the mother-country has ever been acknowledged. It is an impropriety of ſpeech to talk

talk of an independent colony. The words *independency* and *colony*, convey contradictory ideas: much like *killing* and *ſparing*. As ſoon as a colony becomes independent on its parent ſtate, it ceaſes to be any longer a colony; juſt as when you *kill* a ſheep, you ceaſe to *ſpare* him. The Britiſh colonies make a part of the Britiſh empire. As parts of the body they muſt be ſubject to the general laws of the body. To talk of a colony independent of the mother-country, is no better ſenſe than to talk of a limb independent of the body to which it belongs.

In every government there muſt be a ſupreme, abſolute authority lodged ſomewhere. In arbitrary governments this power is in the monarch; in ariſtocratical governments, in the nobles; in democratical in the people, or the deputies of their electing. Our own government being a mixture of all theſe kinds, the ſupreme authority is veſted in the King, Nobles and People, i. e. the King, Houſe of Lords, and Houſe of Commons elected by the People. This ſupreme authority extends as far as the Britiſh dominions extend. To ſuppoſe a part of the

the Britiſh dominions which is not ſubject to the power of the Britiſh legiſlature, is no better ſenſe than to ſuppoſe a country, at one and the ſame time, to be, and not to be a part of the Britiſh dominions. If therefore the colony of New-York be a part of the Britiſh dominions, the colony of New-York is ſubject, and dependent on the ſupreme legiſlative authority of Great-Britain.

Legiſlation is not an inherent right in the colonies. Many colonies have been eſtabliſhed, and ſubſiſted long without it. The Roman colonies had no legiſlative authority. It was till the later period of their republic that the privileges of Roman citizens, among which that of voting in the aſſemblies of the people at Rome was a principal one, were extended to the inhabitants of Italy. All the laws of the empire were enacted at Rome. Neither their colonies, nor conquered countries, had any thing to do with legiſlation.

The poſition that we are bound by no laws to which we have not conſented, either by ourſelves, or our repreſentatives, is a novel poſition, unſupported by any authori-

tative record of the Britiſh conſtitution, ancient or modern. It is republican in its very nature, and tends to the utter ſubverſion of the Engliſh monarchy.

This poſition has ariſen from an artful change of terms. To ſay that an Engliſhman is not bound by any laws, but thoſe to which the repreſentatives of the nation have given their conſent, is to ſay what is true: But to ſay that an Engliſhman is bound by no laws but thoſe to which *he* hath conſented in perſon, or by *his* repreſentative, is ſaying what never was true, and never can be true. A great part of the people in England have no vote in the choice of repreſentatives, and therefore are governed by laws to which they never conſented either by *themſelves* or by *their* repreſentatives.

The right of coloniſts to exerciſe a legiſlative power, is no natural right. They derive it not from nature, but from the indulgence or grant of the parent ſtate, whoſe ſubjects they were when the colony was ſettled, and by whoſe permiſſion and aſſiſtance they made the ſettlement.

Upon

Upon ſuppoſition that every Engliſh colony enjoyed a legiſlative power independent of the parliament; and that the parliament has no juſt authority to make laws to bind them, this abſurdity will follow—that there is no power in the Britiſh empire, which has authority to make laws for the whole empire; i. e. we have an empire, without government; or which amounts to the ſame thing, we have a government which has no ſupreme power. All our colonies are independent of each other: Suppoſe them independent of the Britiſh parliament,—what power do you leave to govern the whole? None at all. You ſplit and divide the empire into a number of petty inſignificant ſtates. This is the direct, the neceſſary tendency of refuſing ſubmiſſion to acts of parliament. Every man who can ſee one inch beyond his noſe, muſt ſee this conſequence. And every man who endeavours to accelerate the independency of the colonies on the Britiſh parliament, endeavours to accelerate the ruin of the Britiſh empire.

To talk of being liege ſubjects to King George, while we diſavow the authority of parliament, is another piece of whiggiſh

nonſenſe. I love my King as well as any whig in America or England either, and am as ready to yield him all lawful ſubmiſſion: But while I ſubmit to the King, I ſubmit to the authority of the laws of the ſtate, whoſe guardian the King is. The difference between a good and a bad ſubject, is only this, that the one obeys, the other tranſgreſſes the law. The difference between a loyal ſubject and a rebel, is, that the one yields obedience to, and faithfully ſupports the ſupreme authority of the ſtate, and the other endeavours to overthrow it. If we obey the laws of the King, we obey the laws of the parliament. If we diſown the authority of the parliament, we diſown the authority of the King. There is no medium without aſcribing powers to the King which the conſtitution knows nothing of:—without making him ſuperior to the laws, and ſetting him above all reſtraint. Theſe are ſome of the ridiculous abſurdities of American whiggiſm.

I am utterly at a loſs what ideas to annex to the phraſes—*dependence on Great-Britain*;—*ſubordination to the Parliament*;—*ſubmiſſion to the ſupreme legiſlative power*:

—unleſs

—unleſs they mean ſome degree of ſubjection to the Britiſh Parliament; ſome acknowledgment of its right to make laws to bind the colonies.

Give me leave, Sir, to tranſcribe for your peruſal, an extract from a petition to the Houſe of Commons, ſent by the General Congreſs, who met at New-York the 19th of October, 1765. Whether this Congreſs was equal in wiſdom, dignity, and authority to that lately aſſembled at Philadelphia, you can determine for yourſelf: However that be, they expreſs themſelves thus:—" It is from and under the Engliſh conſtitution we derive all our civil and religious rights and liberties; we glory in being ſubjects of the beſt of Kings, and having been born under the moſt perfect form of government. We eſteem our connections with, and *dependence* on Great-Britain, as one of our greateſt bleſſings; and apprehend the latter will appear to be ſufficiently ſecure, when it is conſidered that the *inhabitants* in the colonies have the moſt unbounded affection for his Majeſty's perſon, family and government; and and that their *ſubordination to the Parliament* is *univerſally* acknowledged."

A ſtill more reſpectable body, viz. the General Aſſembly of New-York, in the preamble to their reſolutions of the 18th of December, 1765, declare—" That they think it their indiſpenſible duty to make a declaration of their faith and allegiance to his Majeſty, King George the Third, and their *ſubmiſſion to the ſupreme legiſlative power*; and at the ſame time to *ſhew*, that the *rights claimed by them* are in *no manner inconſiſtent* with either."

You have utterly failed in proving, that " The clear voice of natural juſtice," and " the fundamental principles of the Eng- " liſh conſtitution," ſet us free from the ſubordination here acknowledged. Let us ſee the ſucceſs of your next attempt.

You appeal to " our charters, the expreſs " conditions on which our progenitors re- " linquiſhed their native countries, and " came to ſettle in this," and our charters you ſay, " preclude every claim of ruling " and taxing us without our aſſent." Did you examine all the charters of the different colonies, before you made this bold aſſertion? I fear you did not read one of them.

I pre-

I preſume the province of New-York has no charter: at leaſt I never heard of any. The *claim* then, of the Parliament, "of "ruling and taxing *us* without our aſſent," is not precluded by charter.

The firſt charter granted by the crown of England, for the purpoſe of colonization, is that of King James the Firſt to the two Virginia companies. This, as it is explained and enlarged by another charter, dated only three years after, has the following clauſes:— That the Governor and other magiſtrates and officers to be appointed by a Council reſiding in London, are veſted with *full and abſolute power and authority* to *correct*, *puniſh* and *pardon*, *govern* and *rule* all ſuch the ſubjects of us, our heirs and ſucceſſors, as ſhall from time to time adventure themſelves in any voyage thither, or that ſhall at any time inhabit the precincts and territories of the ſaid colony as aforeſaid, according to ſuch orders, ordinances, conſtitutions, directions, and inſtructions, as *by our ſaid Council* as aforeſaid ſhall be eſtabliſhed; and in default thereof, *in caſe of neceſſity*, according to the *good diſcretion* of the *ſaid Governor and officers* reſpectively, as well

in

in caſes *capital as civil*, both maritime and others; ſo always as the ſaid ſtatutes, ordinances and proceedings, as near as conveniently may be, be agreeable to the laws, ſtatutes, government and policy of this our realm of England. The treaſurer and company are exempted from the payment of all duties and taxes for *ſeven years*: But a duty of two and a half *per cent.* is laid by the King upon all merchandize bought or ſold within the precinct of the colony, by Engliſh ſubjects not of the colony; and an additional duty of two and a half *per cent.* more is laid upon all merchandize bought or ſold therein by aliens or foreigners; and the revenue to ariſe from theſe duties is thus *appropriated by the King*: All which ſums of money or benefit, as aforeſaid, for and during the ſpace of twenty-one years next enſuing the date hereof, ſhall be wholly employed to the uſe, benefit, and behoof of the ſaid ſeveral plantations where ſuch traffic ſhall be made: and after the ſaid twenty-one years, the ſame ſhall be *be taken to the uſe of us, our heirs and ſucceſſors*, by ſuch officers and miniſters as by us, our heirs and ſucceſſors, ſhall be thereunto appointed. In a clauſe of the ſecond charter this duty is doubled;

doubled; but it is explained to mean a duty of five *per cent.* upon goods imported, and five *per cent.* on goods exported by Engliſh ſubjects not of the colony, or allowed by the company, and ten *per cent.* to be paid by aliens, *over and above ſuch ſubſidy and cuſtom as the ſaid company is, or hereafter ſhall be, to pay.*

The territory granted by theſe charters to the two Virginia companies, extended from the latitude 34 to the latitude 45, which includes the whole country from the ſouth boundary of Virginia, to the frontiers of Nova-Scotia; and the firſt ſettlers in that part of the territory now called New-England, ſettled under *thoſe very charters*, having purchaſed the right ſo to do from one of theſe companies.

We find, alſo, that the New-England company's *having levied money on the inhabitants*, which their charter gave them no right to do, was one of the principal acts of delinquency alledged in the writ of *fieri facias*, iſſued againſt their charter in the 36th year of Charles the Second, and upon which judgment was given in the Court

of King's-Bench againſt the Governor and company of that colony, and their charter thereon taken away. And in their new charter, granted by King William and Queen Mary, the power to levy taxes is reſtrained to provincial and local purpoſes only, and to be exerciſed over ſuch only as are inhabitants and proprietors of the ſaid province.

The charters of Connecticut and Rhode-Iſland are ſimply matters of incorporation, viz. That they the ſaid John Winthrope, &c. and all others as now, or hereafter ſhall be admitted and *made free of the Company* and Society of our Colony of *Connecticut*, in America (the ſame words are uſed in the charter of Rhode-Iſland) ſhall from this time and for ever after, be *one body corporate and politic*, in act and name, by the name of Governor and Company of the Engliſh colony of Connecticut, in New-England, in America; and that by the ſame they and their ſucceſſors ſhall and may have perpetual ſucceſſion, and ſhall and may be *perſons able and capable in law* to *plead* and be *impleaded*, to *anſwer* and be *anſwered unto*, and to *defend*, and to be *defended* in all

all and ſingular *ſuits, cauſes, quarrels, matters, actions* and *things*, of what kind or nature ſoever. And alſo to have, take, poſſeſs, acquire, and purchaſe lands, tenements or hereditaments, or any goods or chattels, and the ſame to leaſe, grant, demiſe, alien, bargain, ſell and diſpoſe of, as *other* our liege people of this our realm of England, or any *other* corporation or body politic within the ſame.

The charter of Pennſylvania contains the following clauſe: And further our pleaſure is, and for theſe preſents, for us, our heirs, and ſucceſſors, we do covenant and grant to, and with the ſaid William Penn, &c. That we, our heirs and ſucceſſors, ſhall at no time hereafter ſet or make, or cauſe to ſet any impoſition, cuſtom, or other taxation or rate, or contribution whatſoever, in and upon the dwellers and inhabitants of the aforeſaid province, or their lands, tenements, goods or chattels, within the ſaid province, or to be laden or unladen within the ports or harbours of the ſaid province, unleſs the ſame be with the *conſent* of the *Proprietors* or chief Governor or *Aſſembly*, or *by act of Parliament in England*.

Theſe extracts abundantly prove, that the colony charters by no means imply an independence on the ſupreme legiſlative authority of Great-Britain: they prove alſo, that you, Sir, was too haſty when you aſſerted, that "our charters precluded every claim "of ruling and taxing us without our aſ-"ſent." Great-Britain ſtill retains the power of binding the colonies by ſuch laws as ſhe ſhall think neceſſary to ſecure and preſerve the dependence of the colonies on the mother-country;—to promote their particular welfare, or the welfare of the whole empire collectively.

That you will perceive the force of this reaſoning, I pretend not to ſay. A perſon diſeaſed with the jaundice ſees no colour but yellow. Party heat, the fever of liberty, may, for any thing I know, vitiate the mind, as much as the jaundice does the eyes. I flatter myſelf, however, that all reaſonable Americans will feel its force; and will not be led by poſitive aſſertions without proof, nor declamatory harangues without argument, into rebellion againſt the ſupreme authority of the nation: Nor be beguiled of their preſent free and happy

government,

government, by the loud clamours of unreſtrained licentiouſneſs, under the ſpecious name of liberty. Tyranny and ſlavery muſt be the conſequence of the preſent ſyſtem of conduct. If we wantonly throw off that ſubordination to the Britiſh Parliament, which our preſent ſtate requires, we ſhall inevitably fall under the dominion of ſome foreign tyrant, or the more intolerable deſpotiſm of a few American demagogues.

If it be ſaid, that admitting the foregoing reaſoning and authorities, yet the right of taxation will not follow, let it be conſidered, that in every government, *legiſlation* and *taxation*, or the right of raiſing a revenue, muſt be conjoined. If you divide them, you weaken, and finally deſtroy the government; for no government can long ſubſiſt without power to raiſe the ſupplies neceſſary for its defence and adminiſtration. It has been proved, that the ſupreme authority of the Britiſh empire extends over all the dominions that compoſe the empire. The power, or right of the Britiſh Parliament to raiſe ſuch a revenue as is neceſſary for the defence and ſupport of the Britiſh government, in all parts of the Britiſh domi-

dominions, is therefore inconteſtable. For if no government can ſubſiſt without a power to raiſe the revenues neceſſary for its ſupport, then, in fact, no government can extend any further than its power of raiſing ſuch a revenue extends. If therefore the Britiſh Parliament has no power to raiſe a revenue in the colonies, it has no government over the colonies, i. e. no government that can ſupport itſelf. The burthen of ſupporting its government over the colonies muſt lie upon the other parts of the empire. But this is unreaſonable. Government implies, not only a power of making and enforcing *laws*, but defence and protection. Now protection implies tribute. Thoſe that ſhare in the protection of any government, are in reaſon and duty, bound to maintain and ſupport the government that protects them: Otherwiſe they deſtroy their own protection; or elſe they throw an unjuſt burthen on their fellow-ſubjects, which they ought to bear in common with them. While therefore the colonies are under the Britiſh government, and ſhare in its protection, the Britiſh government has a right to raiſe, and they are in reaſon and duty bound to pay, a reaſonable and proportionable

portionable part of the expence of its administration.

The authority of the Britiſh Parliament, that is, of the ſupreme ſovereign authority of the Britiſh empire, over the colonies, and its right to raiſe a proportional part of its revenue, for the ſupport of its government, in the colonies, being eſtabliſhed; it is to be conſidered, what is the moſt reaſonable and equitable method of doing it.

Notwithſtanding the large landed eſtate poſſeſſed by the Britiſh ſubjects in the different parts of the world, they muſt be conſidered as a commercial, manufacturing people. The welfare, perhaps the exiſtence of Great-Britain as an independent or ſovereign ſtate, depends upon her manufactures and trade: and many people in America think, that her manufactories and commerce depend in a great meaſure on her intercourſe with her colonies; inſomuch that if this ſhould be neglected, her commerce would decline and die away; her wealth would ceaſe, and her maritime power be at an end. If theſe obſervations be juſt, they eſtabliſh the right of the *Britiſh*

tiſh parliament to regulate the commerce of the whole empire, beyond poſſibility of contradiction; a denial of it would be a denial of a right in the Britiſh empire to preſerve itſelf. They prove alſo that all parts of the Britiſh empire muſt be ſubject to the *Britiſh parliament*, for otherwiſe the trade of the *whole* cannot be regulated. They point out alſo the beſt mode of raiſing ſuch a revenue as is neceſſary for the ſupport and defence of the government, viz. by duties on imports and exports; becauſe theſe are attended with the leaſt inconveniency to the ſubject, and may be ſo managed as to raiſe a revenue, and regulate the trade at the ſame time.

Good policy will require, that the heavier duties be laid upon articles of luxury, eſpecially foreign ones: and that as little as poſſible be laid upon the raw materials for manufactures, and upon our own exports.

The right of the Britiſh parliament to regulate the trade of the whole empire has been fully acknowledged by ſome of the warmeſt advocates for American liberty. The Pennſylvania Farmer, in his ſecond letter,

letter, expreſſes himſelf fully to the point. " The parliament unqueſtionably poſſeſſes " a legal authority to regulate the trade of " Great-Britain, and all her colonies. Such " an authority is eſſential to the relation " between a mother-country and her colo- " nies, and neceſſary for the common good " of all. He who conſiders theſe provinces, " as *States diſtinct from the Britiſh empire*, " has very ſlender notions of *juſtice*, or of " *their intereſts:* We are *but parts of a* " *whole*, and therefore there *muſt exiſt a* " *power ſomewhere, to preſide, and preſerve* " *the connection in due order:* This power " is *lodged in the parliament.*" In the ſame letter, he ſays, that " we, the colonies, may " be legally bound by *act of parliament*, to " pay any *general duties* relative to the re- " gulation of trade, is granted."

When it is conſidered, that Great-Britain is a maritime power; that the preſent flouriſhing ſtate of her trade, and of the trade of her colonies, depends in a great meaſure, upon the protection which they receive from her navy; that her own ſecurity depends upon her navy; and that it is principally a naval protection that we receive

from her, there will appear a peculiar propriety in laying the chief burthen of ſupporting her navy upon her commerce, and in requeſting us to bear a part of the expence, proportional to our ability, and to that protection and ſecurity which we receive from it.

There are but two objections that can reaſonably be made to what has been ſaid upon this ſubject. The firſt is, that if the Britiſh parliament has a right to make laws to bind the whole empire, our aſſemblies become uſeleſs. But a little conſideration will remove this difficulty.

Our aſſemblies, from the very nature of things, can have but a legated, ſubordinate, and local authority of legiſlation. Their power of making laws, in conjunction with the other branches of the legiſlature, cannot extend beyond the limits of the province to which they belong. Their authority muſt be ſubordinate to the ſupreme ſovereign authority of the nation, or there is *imperium in imperio:* two ſovereign authorities in the ſame ſtate; which is a contradiction. Every thing that relates to the internal policy and

govern-

government of the province which they repreſent comes properly before them, whether they be matters of law or revenue. But all laws relative to the empire in general, or to all the colonies conjunctively, or which regulates the trade of any particular colony, in order to make it compatible with the general good of the whole empire, muſt be left to the parliament. There is no other authority which has a *right* to make ſuch regulations, or *weight* ſufficient to carry them into execution.

Our Aſſemblies are alſo the true, proper, legal guardians of our *rights*, *privileges*, and *liberties*. If any laws of the Britiſh Parliament are thought oppreſſive; or if, in the adminiſtration of the Britiſh government, any unneceſſary or unreaſonable burthen be laid upon us, *they* are the proper perſons to ſeek for redreſs: And they are the moſt likely to ſucceed. They have the legal and conſtitutional means in their hands. They are the *real*, not the *pretended* repreſentatives of the people. They are bodies known, and acknowledged by the public laws of the empire. Their repre-

ſentations will be attended to, and their remonſtrances heard.

To the honour of the Aſſemblies of this province, as far back as I am able to judge, be it ſpoken,---they have always diſcharged this duty with *fidelity*, *prudence*, and *firmneſs*; and with ſuch ſucceſs, as ought to encourage us to rely upon their wiſdom and good conduct, to deliver us from our preſent embarraſſed ſtate with our mother-country; and from that abject ſlavery and cruel oppreſſion, which the tyranny of the late Congreſs has brought upon us.

Conſidered in this light, they are a body of real dignity, and of the utmoſt importance: And whoever attempts to leſſen their influence, or diſparage their authority, ought to be conſidered as an enemy to the liberties of his country. Had our preſent conteſts with Great-Britain been left to *their* management, I would not have ſaid a word. But their authority is contravened and ſuperſeded by a power from without the province. Virginia and Maſſachuſetts madmen, met at Philadelphia, have made laws for the province of New-York,

York, and have rendered our Aſſembly *uſeleſs*; and unleſs they exert their proper authority with a ſpirit becoming their own dignity, *inſignificant*.---Virginia and Maſſachuſetts madmen? You'll exclaim! Aye, *madmen*,---*mad* beyond all doubt;---ſo *mad*, that an acre of Hellebore apiece will not cure them. Why do you fret, Sir!--- They *talked* like madmen: They *acted* like madmen: They *raved* like madmen: They *did every thing* like madmen: Then why not *call* them madmen?---Why not? Why! they were the *repreſentatives* of the people. And very fit repreſentatives too. It could not be expected that *mad* people would ſend any other than *mad* repreſentatives;---and *mad* work they made when they got together.

You, Sir, affect to conſider the Gentlemen that went from this province to the Congreſs, as the *repreſentatives* of the province. You know in your conſcience that they were not choſen by a hundredth part of the people. You know alſo, that their appointment was in a way unſupported by any *law*, *uſage*, or *cuſtom* of the province. You know alſo, that the people of this province

province had already delegated their power to the members of their Aſſembly, and therefore had no right to chooſe Delegates, to contravene the authority of the Aſſembly, by introducing a foreign power of legiſlation. Yet you conſider thoſe Delegates, in a point of light equal to our *legal* repreſentatives; for you ſay, that "our *repreſentatives* in General Aſſembly "cannot take any wiſer or better courſe "to ſettle our differences, than our *repre-* "*ſentatives* in the Continental Congreſs "have taken."---Then I affirm, that our repreſentatives ought to go to ſchool for ſeven years, before they are returned to ſerve again. No wiſer or better courſe? Then they muſt take juſt the courſe that the Congreſs have taken;---for a *worſe*, or more *fooliſh*, they cannot take, ſhould they try: If they act any way different from the Congreſs, they muſt act *better* and *wiſer*.--- But more of this by and by.

The other objection to what has been ſaid upon the legiſlative authority of the Britiſh Parliament, is this: That if the Parliament have authority to make laws to bind the whole empire;---to regulate the trade

trade of the whole empire;---and to raiſe a revenue upon the whole empire; then we have nothing that we can call our own: ---By the ſame authority that they can take a penny, they can take a pound, or all we have got.

Let it be conſidered, that no ſcheme of human policy can be ſo contrived and guarded, but that ſomething muſt be left to the integrity, prudence, and wiſdom of thoſe who govern. We are apt to think, and I believe juſtly, that the Britiſh conſtitution is the beſt ſcheme of government now ſubſiſting: The rights and liberties of the people are better ſecured by it, than by any other ſyſtem now ſubſiſting. And yet we find that the rights and liberties of Engliſhmen may be infringed by wicked and ambitious men. This will ever be the caſe, even after human ſagacity has exerted its utmoſt ability. This is, however, no argument, that we ſhould not ſecure ourſelves as well as we can. It is rather an argument, that we ſhould uſe our utmoſt endeavour to guard againſt the attempts of ambition or avarice.

A great part of the people in England, a conſiderable number of people in this province, are bound by laws, and taxed without their conſent, or the conſent of their repreſentatives: for repreſentatives they have none, unleſs the abſurd poſition of a *virtual* repreſentation be admitted. Theſe people may object to the preſent mode of government. They may ſay, that they have nothing that they can call their own. That if they may be taxed a penny without their conſent, they may be taxed a pound; and ſo on. You will think it a ſufficient ſecurity to theſe people, that the repreſentatives of the nation or province cannot hurt *them*, without hurting themſelves; becauſe, they cannot tax *them*, without taxing themſelves. This ſecurity however may not be ſo effectual as at firſt may be imagined. The rich are never taxed ſo much in proportion to their eſtates as the poor: And even an equal proportion of that tax which a rich man can eaſily pay, may be a heavy burthen to a poor man. But the ſame ſecurity that theſe people have againſt being ruined by the repreſentatives of the nation, or province where they live, the ſame ſecurity have we againſt being ruined

ruined by the Britiſh parliament. They cannot hurt us without hurting themſelves. The principal profits of our trade center in England. If they lay unneceſſary or oppreſſive burthens on it; or any ways reſtrain it, ſo as to injure us, they will ſoon feel the effect, and very readily remove the cauſe. If this ſecurity is thought inſufficient, let us endeavour to obtain a more effectual one. Let it however be remembered, that this ſecurity has been thought, and found ſufficient till within a ſhort period; and very probably, a prudent management, and a temperate conduct on our part, would have made it permanently effectual.

But the colonies have become ſo conſiderable by the increaſe of their inhabitants and commerce, and by the improvement of their lands, that they ſeem incapable of being governed in the ſame lax and precarious manner as formerly. They are arrived to that mature ſtate of manhood which requires a different, and more exact policy of ruling, than was neceſſary in their infancy and childhood. They want, and are entitled to, a fixed determinate conſtitution of their own. A conſtitution which ſhall

unite them firmly with Great-Britain, and with one another;---which ſhall mark out the line of Britiſh ſupremacy, and colonical dependence; giving on the one hand full force to the ſupreme authority of the nation over all its dominions, and on the other, ſecuring effectually the rights, liberty, and property of coloniſts.---This is an event devoutly to be wiſhed, by all good men; and which all ought to labour to obtain, by all prudent and probable means. Without obtaining this, it is idle to talk of obtaining a redreſs of the grievances complained of. They naturally, they neceſſarily reſult from the relation which we at preſent ſtand in to Great-Britain.

You, Sir, argue through your whole pamphlet, upon an aſſumed point, viz. That the Britiſh government---the *King*, *Lords*, and *Commons*, have laid a regular plan to enſlave America; and that they are now deliberately putting it in execution. This point has never been proved, though it has been aſſerted over, and over, and over again. If you ſay, that they have declared their right of making laws, to *bind us in all caſes whatſoever:* I anſwer; that, the declarative

rative act here referred to, means no more than to aſſert the ſupreme authority of Great-Britain over all her dominions.---If you ſay, that they have exerciſed this power in a wanton, oppreſſive manner;---it is a point, that I am not enough acquainted with the *minutiæ* of government to determine. It may be true. The colonies are undoubtedly alarmed on account of their liberties. Artful men have availed themſelves of the opportunity, and have excited ſuch ſcenes of contention between the parent ſtate and the colonies, as afford none but dreadful proſpects. Republicans ſmile at the confuſion that they themſelves have, in a great meaſure made, and are exerting all their influence, by ſedition and rebellion, to ſhake the Britiſh empire to its very baſis, that they may have an opportunity of erecting their beloved commonwealth on its ruins. If greater ſecurity to our rights and liberties be neceſſary than the preſent form and adminiſtration of the government can give us, let us endeavour to obtain it; but let our endeavours be regulated by prudence and probability of ſucceſs. In this attempt all good men will join, both in England and America: All,

who love their country, and wiſh the proſperity of the Britiſh empire, will be glad to ſee it accompliſhed.

Before we ſet out to obtain this ſecurity, we ſhould have had prudence enough to ſettle one point among ourſelves. We ſhould have conſidered what ſecurity it was we wanted;---what conceſſions, on the part of Great-Britain, would have been ſufficient to have fixed our rights and liberties on a firm and permanent foundation. This was the proper buſineſs of our aſſemblies, and to them we ought to have applied; and why we did not apply to them, no one tolerable reaſon can be aſſigned:---A buſineſs which *our* aſſembly, at leaſt, is equal to, whether we conſider their abilities as men, or their authority as repreſentatives of the province; and a buſineſs which, I doubt not, they would have executed with prudence, firmneſs and ſucceſs.---I ſay nothing of the other aſſemblies on the continent, for I know little of them; only, that they were the proper perſons to have managed this affair.

But

But we ran headlong to work, without ever conſidering the point we aimed at, or determining what the conceſſions were, with which we would be ſatisfied. Nor is this, indeed, ſo much to be wondered at. The preſent commotions were firſt excited, not by patriotiſm, but the ſelfiſhneſs of thoſe merchants who had engroſſed the tea-trade with Holland. All was quiet till *they* were alarmed by the deſign of ſending the tea belonging to the Eaſt-India company, to be ſold in the colonies. Then began the cry of liberty, which hath ſince been ſo loudly echoed, and re-echoed, through the continent.

Nor have the ſteps we have ſince taken, been a whit more prudent, than the manner in which we ſet out.

Every man who wiſhes well, either to America or Great-Britain, muſt wiſh to ſee a hearty and firm union ſubſiſting between them, and between every part of the Britiſh empire. The firſt object of his deſire will be to heal the unnatural breach that now ſubſiſts, and to accompliſh a ſpeedy reconciliation. All parties declare the utmoſt

moſt willingneſs to live in union with Great-Britain. They profeſs the utmoſt loyalty to the King; the warmeſt affection to their fellow-ſubjects in England, Ireland, and the Weſt-Indies, and their readineſs to do every thing to promote their welfare, that can reaſonably be expected from them. Even thoſe republicans, who wiſh the deſtruction of every ſpecies and appearance of monarchy in the world, find it neceſſary to put on a fair face, and make the ſame declaration.

What ſteps, Sir, I beſeech you, has the Congreſs taken to accompliſh theſe good purpoſes? Have they fixed any determined point for us to aim at? They have, and the point marked out by them, is, *abſolute* independence on Great-Britain;---a perfect diſcharge from all ſubordination to the ſupreme authority of the Britiſh empire.---Have they propoſed any method of cementing our union with the mother-country? Yes, but a queer one, viz. to break off all dealings and intercourſe with her.---Have they done any thing to ſhew their love and affection to their fellow-ſubjects in England, Ireland, and the Weſt-Indies?---Undoubtedly

edly they have,---they have endeavoured to ſtarve them all to death.---Is this "*Equity?*" Is this "*Wiſdom?*"---Then murder is equity, and folly wiſdom.

I will here, Sir, venture to deliver my ſentiments upon the line that ought to be drawn between the ſupremacy of Great-Britain, and the dependency of the Colonies. And I ſhall do it with the more boldneſs, becauſe I know it to be agreeable to the opinions of many of the warmeſt advocates for America, both in England and in the colonies, in the time of the ſtamp-act.---I imagine, that if all internal taxation be veſted in our own legiſlatures, and the right of regulating trade by duties, bounties, &c. be left in the power of the Parliament; and alſo the right of enacting all general laws for the good of all the colonies, that we ſhall have all the ſecurity for our rights, liberties, and property, which human policy can give us: The dependence of the colonies on the mother-country will be fixed on a firm foundation; the ſovereign authority of Parliament, over all the dominions of the empire will be eſtabliſhed, and the mother-country and all her colonies will be knit

knit together, in ONE GRAND, FIRM, AND COMPACT BODY.

I do not think my ſentiments of ſo much weight, as to wiſh to obtrude them on the public. There are ſome reaſons, however, in favour of the above ſcheme, which I beg leave to mention.

It ſeems to me to be agreeable to the ſentiments delivered by the beſt friends of America, in the debates in the Houſe of Lords, and Houſe of Commons, upon the bill for repealing the ſtamp act. I have not theſe debates by me; but I remember particularly, that though the preſent Earl of Chatham argued againſt the propriety of raiſing internal taxes in America, by virtue of an act of Parliament, yet he openly avowed the right of Parliament to regulate the trade of the colonies.

This is a ſcheme which we ſhall probably ſucceed in, if we attempt it with proper prudence and temper. It appears to me ſo reaſonable in itſelf, that I am perſuaded the juſtice of the nation will not refuſe it, when applied for in a conſtitutional way.

We

We ſhall alſo probably have many warm, and ſenſible advocates both among the Lords and Commons, to ſupport our application.

If we graſp at too much, we ſhall loſe every thing. The Parliament will never give up the right of regulating the trade of the colonies. If they meet with ever ſo much oppoſition from us, it will only make them the more ſenſible of the neceſſity of retaining and ſupporting their power. By inſiſting upon their relinquiſhing this right, we ſhall diſoblige and loſe our beſt friends in England. The people of this province thought themſelves under ſo great obligations to Mr. Pitt, now Earl of Chatham, for the pains he took in getting the ſtamp-act repealed, that they erected his ſtatue in New-York, to perpetuate their gratitude. Yet, if I remember right, he expeſſes himſelf, in his celebrated ſpeech upon that occaſion, in words that ought to make the deepeſt impreſſion on us, at this time. I cannot pretend to quote exactly from memory. The expreſſion I allude to, is to this purpoſe: "Confine their trade and their "manufactures; exerciſe every power over

" them, except that of taking money out " of their pockets." Another ſentiment of his with regard to the celonies, is to this purpoſe; " If Great-Britain has no ſove- " reign, ſupreme, legiſlative authority over " America, I would adviſe every landed " gentleman among us, to ſell his eſtate, " and go to that country." Can we expect that the Earl of Chatham will expoſe himſelf to ridicule and contempt, by ſupporting us in demands directly repugnant to his ſentiments delivered in the Houſe of Commons? The misfortune is, that we have riſen in our demands ſince that time, and now require ſo much, that no honeſt man in England, can abet or ſupport us in them.

This ſcheme will ſecure us from ſlavery, and too abject a dependence on our fellow-ſubjects in England. The Parliament can hurt us in no way but by an internal tax on our eſtates, without injuring the nation in an equal degree. If they lay unneceſſary, or oppreſſive duties on trade, they will immediately feel the effect; and as ſoon as the cauſe is pointed out, they will, for their own ſakes, remove it.

If we ſhould ſucceed in depriving Great-Britain of the power of regulating our trade, the colonies will probably be ſoon at variance with each other. Their commercial intereſts will interfere; there will be no ſupreme power to interpoſe, and diſcord and animoſity muſt enſue.

And upon the whole—if the Parliament can regulate our trade, ſo as to make it conduce to the general good of the whole empire, as well as to our particular profit; if they can protect us in the ſecure enjoyment of an extenſive and lucrative commerce, and at the ſame time can raiſe a part of the revenue neceſſary to ſupport their naval power, without which our commerce cannot be ſafe, every reaſonable man, I ſhould imagine, would think it beſt to let them enjoy it in peace; without deſcending to the mean, paltry, narrow, ſtupid deſign of the Congreſs, to have them all ſworn, King, Lords and Commons, upon the Holy Evangeliſts of Almighty God, that all the duties by them laid, are, *bona fide*, intended as regulations of trade, and not to raiſe one ſingle braſs farthing, by way of revenue. Diſdainful thought! You, Sir, may, if you

pleaſe, pride yourſelf in this ſuſpicious, jealous, parſimonious, ſtingy, contracted diſpoſition of the Congreſs; you may call it *equity*, *wiſdom*, *dignity*: Be it my glory to have contributed, even in the ſmalleſt degree, to the honour, ſplendor, and majeſty of the Britiſh empire. My anceſtors were among the firſt Engliſhmen who ſettled in America. I have no intereſt but in America. I have not a relation out of it that I know of. Yet, let me die! but I had rather be reduced to the laſt ſhilling, than that the imperial dignity of Great-Britain ſhould ſink, or be controlled by any people or power on earth.

But whatever mode may be thought proper to attempt the ſettlement of an American conſtitution in, and to heal the breach between the mother-country and the colonies, the one adopted by the Congreſs is certainly deficient, both in point of prudence and efficacy. In the commotions occaſioned by the ſtamp-act, we recurred to petitions and remonſtrances; our grievances were pointed out, and redreſs ſolicited, with temper and decency. They were heard, they were attended to, and the diſagreeable

act

act repealed. The ſame mode of application ſucceeded with regard to the duties laid upon glaſs, painters colours, &c. You ſay, indeed, that our addreſſes on this occaſion were "treated with contempt and neglect." But I beſeech you, were not our addreſſes received, read, and debated upon? and was not the repeal of thoſe acts the conſequence? The fact, you know, is as I ſtate it. If theſe acts were not only diſagreeable to the Americans, but were alſo "found to mili-"tate againſt the commercial intereſts of "Great-Britain," it proves what I have aſſerted above, that duties which injure our trade, will ſoon be felt in England, and then there will be no difficulty in getting them repealed.

Your next inſtance to prove the inefficacy of remonſtrances and petitions, is taken from the application of the Boſton aſſembly, againſt their governor; this, you ſay, "was "treated with the greateſt indignity, and "ſtigmatized as a *ſeditious*, *vexatious*, and "*ſcandalous libel.*" And yet, in truth, this petition was treated with all the regard that poſſibly could be paid to it. It was received by the King: the Governor, againſt whom the

the complaint was made, was called to a public trial, before the only court where the cauſe was cognizable, the King in council. The Boſton aſſembly could not ſupport their charge; and the Governor was acquitted. This you call *ſtigmatizing* their petition, as a *ſeditious*, *vexatious*, and *ſcandalous libel*. If it was ſo, why ſhould not the court ſtigmatize it as ſuch? If it was not ſo, why did not that aſſembly ſupport their charge? They could as eaſily have ſent a ſtate of the facts upon which they grounded their complaint, and the evidence to ſupport them, to England, as they ſent the complaint: And if they did not do it, it is more than probable, that they had none to ſend.

Some people have got a ſtrange way of complaining, petitioning, and remonſtrating, in a manner that they know muſt fail, and then they make a great noiſe about the diſregard with which their applications are treated. I wiſh I could ſee the petition of the late congreſs to the King: I will lay a pound to a penny, that it is exactly of this ſtamp.

There

There is alſo this reaſon why we ſhould, at leaſt, have tried the mode of petition and remonſtrance, to obtain a removal of the grievances we complain of. The friends of America, in England, have ſtrongly recommended it, as the moſt decent and probable means of ſucceeding. It would have given them a fair opportunity of becoming advocates in our cauſe, and of ſupporting us in all our juſt and reaſonable demands. But by the haſty reſolves and violent proceedings of the Congreſs, we have effectually prevented them from appearing in our behalf; and if the information from England be true, we have, by our haughty demands of independency on the ſupreme legiſlature of the nation, detached moſt of them from our intereſt, and forced them to take part againſt us.

It was to this circumſtance I adverted, when, in the *Free Thoughts* I ſaid in general terms, that the proceedings of the Congreſs would alienate the affections of the people in Great-Britain, and of friends, make them our enemies. You make light of this, and ſeem ſo confident of having the people of England at your devotion, that you

you imagine, as ſoon as your redoubtable Congreſs gives the word, they will ſpurn all the reſtraints of law and government, fly upon the parliament and miniſtry, and on them "revenge the evils they may feel;" —a little time, Sir, will determine whether you, or I, judge right in this particular.

You talk much of the *juſtice*, *vigour*, *policy*, and *probable* ſucceſs of the meaſures adopted by the Congreſs. I have ſhewn, and ſhall ſhew more fully, that it is highly improbable that they will ſucceed; and that they are not founded in good policy, but in arrant folly. Their vigour I muſt confeſs: But the misfortune is, they will be moſt vigorous to our own hurt. If a man puts a piſtol to his breaſt and draws the trigger, the piſtol will fire juſt as vigorouſly as if he turned the muzzle the other way, but the conſequence will be very different.

The landed and trading intereſts of this country both depend principally upon our exports. If our exports ſhould ceaſe only for a year, not only the produce of our lands, but the lands themſelves, would ſink amazingly in value. A great number of people

people would be out of employ, and ſtrolling through the country, would become the wretched objects both of pity and dread. Thieves, robbers, and highwaymen would render life and property very precarious. We ſhould then taſte the ſweets of *natural* liberty, and ſee the *natural* rights of mankind exemplified in dreadful inſtances. We ſhould then have reaſon and leiſure enough to repent of our folly, and lament that infatuation, which tempted us to *graſp* at the mere *ſhadow* of civil freedom, while we loſt its real *ſubſtance*.

Every man of common ſenſe muſt laugh at your ſcheme of clothing ourſelves with our own manufactures. The folly of it is too glaring to eſcape obſervation.—Continue the non-importation; and the firſt winter after our Engliſh goods are conſumed, we ſhall be ſtarving with cold.—*Kill* your ſheep ever ſo *ſparingly*, keep every *weather*, as well as ewe, to increaſe the number, and improve the breed of ſheep; make every other mode of farming ſubſervient to the raiſing of ſheep; and the requiſite quantity of wool to clothe the inhabitants of this continent, will not be obtained in twenty

years: If they increaſe only as they have done, not in fifty.

The cotton you ſpeak of, muſt come from the ſouthern colonies. Should Great-Britain block up our ports, how are we to get it? Bring it by land? The expence I fear would be too great, at leaſt for the poor.

Beſides: Who is to manufacture this wool and cotton after we have got it. The country people manufacture as much cloth as they can already; and you will find that it requires full as much *legerdemain* to *convert* an American ſailor or ſhipwright into a *ſpinſter* or weaver, as to convert an Engliſh *clothier* into a *blackſmith*. The people of England, Sir, have this advantage over us, ſhould our non-importation diſtreſs their manufacturers.—Every man may apply himſelf to labour on a farm, and would become expert enough at it to get his bread. The price of grain would be much advanced in France, Spain, and in the Mediterranean, as ſoon as the ſupply from America was cut off. They could therefore have the greateſt encouragement to raiſe, and export grain to foreign

foreign markets. But our people would not be employed in this way; for when our exports are ſtopped, our grain would become of little worth: And I imagine that our ſailors, &c. will make no better phyſicians, parſons, lawyers, "philoſophers, poets, "painters, and muſicians," than the Engliſh mechanics.

Let it alſo be conſidered, that notwithſtanding the preſent high cultivation of the lands in England, that kingdom is ſtill capable of being improved by agriculture and commerce, ſo as to maintain double the number of people that it does at preſent: Probably the emigrations to America and the Eaſt-Indies, have been the principal cauſe of preventing it hitherto.

With regard to the north part of Britain, —the ancient kingdom of Scotland, the improvements that have been made in it, particularly within the laſt thirty years, are amazing. The enterprizing ſpirit, and the perſevering efforts of the people, have opened an eaſy intercourſe between all parts of the country, by means of the nobleſt roads and canals. A taſte for the liberal arts and

ſciences has been a long time characteriſtic of the nation. And commerce hath enriched them to that degree, that I have heard it confidently aſſerted, that the ſingle province of Virginia, owes the ſingle city of Glaſgow, at this very time, no leſs than two hundred thouſand pounds ſterling. To get rid of their enormous debt, at a ſtroke, may be the grand reaſon why the Virginians are ſo ready to embrace any ſcheme that promiſes exemption from the Britiſh government.---Such an attempt may raiſe the indignation of the Scots againſt the Virginians, but not againſt the government. They have too long taſted the ſweets of peace, order, agriculture, and a flouriſhing commerce: They have ever been attached to monarchy: They have got over thoſe difficulties which a warm affection for a particular family involved them in, and for courage, abilities, and loyalty, are ſurpaſſed by no ſubjects of the Britiſh dominions.

To return: We once tried this manufacturing ſcheme in this province. All orders and degrees of people became enthuſiaſtically fond of home-ſpun cloths. Our ſheep and lambs were *killed* as *ſparingly* as poſſible.

poſſible. The beſt encouragement was given to the artificers. How it ſucceeded the managers can inform you.

I mentioned the injuſtice and cruelty of one meaſure of the Congreſs, which I thought indicated a diſpoſition to diſtreſs the people of Great-Britain, Ireland, and the Weſt-Indies, who had done us no injury. You, Sir, avow this deſign, and juſtify it in a way that does no honour, either to your head or your heart. You repreſent them as being *politically criminal*, becauſe they have not endeavoured to *prevent the injuries* which, you ſay, the Britiſh Parliament has brought upon us, and are therefore to "be regarded, in ſome meaſure, "as accomplices."---There is about as much propriety, juſtice and truth in this reaſoning, as there would be in arguing your right to *ſtarve* your neighbour, becauſe he did not prevent your falling into a fever, though you would live after your own way, and never aſked his aſſiſtance at all.

Are the Iriſh and Weſt-Indians accountable for our mad freaks? Do you expect to extend the tyranny of the Congreſs over the

the whole Britiſh empire, by the mere legerdemain of calling it American freedom? Do you think that the Iriſh and Weſt-Indians are, in *duty bound*, to enter into our non-importation, non-conſumption, and non-exportation agreement, till all our grievances and complaints, real and pretended, are removed? and that they deſerve to be ſtarved if they do not? Enjoy your folly and malevolence if you can.

You ſay, that "it is impoſſible to exculpate a people that ſuffers its rulers to "abuſe and tyrannize over others." You will allow, I preſume, that the abettors and ſupporters of the preſent meaſures in America, are a numerous people: How will you exculpate them, who ſuffer their rulers, the Congreſs and Committees, rulers whom they themſelves have appointed, "to abuſe "and tyrannize over others," in the moſt unwarrantable, illegal, and unheard-of manner. All this, I ſuppoſe, is right. The *tyranny* of a mob, is the *freedom* of America: but if the people of England, Ireland, and the Weſt-Indies, will not, at your command, riſe and tear their rulers in pieces,

they

they are perfect ſlaves; they cannot be exculpated; they deſerve to be ſtarved.

In Page 22, you diſdain the imputation, on the Congreſs, of endeavouring "to "threaten, bully, or frighten any perſon "into a compliance with" your "demands," by exciting clamours and riots in England. Yet in the 14th Page you openly declare, "that the deſign of the Congreſs in their "proceedings was, to influence the mini-"ſtry to give up their enterprize; or "otherwiſe, to rouze the inhabitants of "Great-Britain, Ireland, and the Weſt-"Indies, from their ſtate of neutrality, and "engage them to unite with us in oppoſing "the lawleſs hand of tyranny." And in Page 21ſt, you give this reaſon why the non exportation was put off to a diſtant period, viz. "The proſpect of its taking "place, and of the evils attendant upon it, "will be a prevailing motive with the mini-"ſtry to abandon their malignant ſchemes." ---This, I think, is ſomething like endeavouring to *bully* and *frighten* the miniſtry into a *compliance* with your demands, and implies ſomething more than a ſeeming contradiction. To reconcile it may be a

proper

proper employment for your hours of leiſure: At preſent pleaſe to attend me a little further.

There appears to me to be an error in your vindication, which is common to all the writers of your party. You over-rate the importance of theſe colonies to the Britiſh empire. You ſeem to think that it depends entirely on our trade, whether it ſhall or ſhall not exiſt.

That as ſoon as we ſtop our imports, England will have no vent for her woollens, Ireland for her linens, nor the Weſt-Indies for their ſugars: that as ſoon as our non-importation takes place, Ireland will be without flax-ſeed, and the Weſt-Indies without flour or lumber. The exportation of Britiſh manufactures to America is but ſmall, compared with that to other parts of the world. The ſhips that trade to thoſe colonies that are engaged in the preſent unnatural diſpute with their mother-country, however numerous they may appear in your eyes, bear but a ſmall proportion to thoſe which navigate the Thames, the Severn, &c. Aſk any one capable of informing you,

you, and you will ſoon be convinced, that but a ſmall proportion of the Yorkſhire cloth comes to this country. The eſtimate may eaſily be made by comparing the number of ſhips that ſail from Hull, &c. to theſe colonies, with thoſe that ſail to the Baltic, and other parts of Europe.

Beſides, the American market hath hitherto had the preference in England. They looked out for no vent for thoſe articles which we wanted. Should their trade with us fail, very ſmall conceſſions to Portugal, Ruſſia, Turkey, &c. would open a vent for all they could ſend. I have no inclination to leſſen our importance to the Britiſh empire. I acknowledge it to be conſiderable: but if we eſtimate it ſo high as to ſuppoſe that Great-Britain could not ſubſiſt without us, or could not ſubſiſt in a happy and flouriſhing ſtate, we deceive ourſelves with fancied notions of our own conſequence. Nor, Sir, did I ever attempt to declaim upon the "omnipotency and all-ſufficiency "of Great-Britain." Theſe are *your* not *my* expreſſions. Great-Britain may be a flouriſhing and powerful ſtate, without being omnipotent. She may be happy, and

proſperous, and have great reſources, without being all-ſufficient. Whenever I attempt to declaim, as I know my abilities to be but moderate, I ſhall take care to chooſe a copious ſubject, and one that is founded in "*truth and reality*;" and the *omnipotency* and *all-ſufficiency* of the late *Grand Continental Congreſs* ſhall be *my* theme, in preference to every other one. However, I believe it will be moſt prudent for me, to leave the field of declamation to you. Your genius ſeems exactly fitted for making excurſions round its flowery bodies; there you may ſelect noſegays of the moſt odorous perfumes, and wear chaplets of never-failing colours, to refreſh and adorn, the patriotic heroes that lately met at Philadelphia.

Let us now pay a ſhort viſit to poor Ireland, another victim, devoted by the Congreſs to the infernal Gods, to render them propitious to ſedition and rebellion. Where will Ireland find purchaſers for her linens, ſo numerous and wealthy as we are? This is a queſtion which you think will ſurpaſs the "profound ſagacity of Mr. A. W. "Farmer," to anſwer. In truth, Sir, Mr. A. W.

A. W. Farmer, has ſagacity enough to perceive, that he is under no obligation to anſwer it at all. He knows, however, that the Iriſh can do juſt as well with their linens upon their hands, as we can with our flax-ſeed upon ours. He knows alſo that we ſhould ſuffer as much for the want of their linens, as they would for the want of our flax-ſeed. He knows alſo, that there was a time when Ireland ſubſiſted as many inhabitants as ſhe does now, without any linen manufactory at all; and he knows that what has been done, may be done again. He knows, moreover, that theſe provinces uſed formerly to take all their linens from Holland and Germany. He knows that all the Dutchmen and Germans are not ſtarved to death ſince that trade failed them. He knows that the Iriſh have as good a country to live in as either the Dutch or Germans. He knows that they are as capable of any ſcience, or of any buſineſs, agriculture, commerce, navigation, manufactures, as any of their neighbours. He knows that they are a generous, hoſpitable, gallant-ſpirited, loyal people: and he knows that the Americans can neither force them into rebellion, nor ſtarve

them to death. "The profound ſagacity "of Mr. A. W. Farmer," Sir, can "explore" ſo much knowledge as this. Nay, he knows a little more.

He knows that you are very much miſtaken when you ſay, that the Iriſh cannot get a ſufficient ſupply of flax-ſeed, except from theſe colonies. You ſeem to think that Ireland, at preſent, buys up all the flax-ſeed that all the world can ſpare, and all the flax raiſed in the countries bordering on the Baltic. I have enquired of very good judges, they all aſſure me that a very conſiderable ſupply may be obtained from Holland, and from the Baltic; that Canada will probably attend to the cultivation of flax, eſpecially if we ſhould excite her to do it, by yielding up the Iriſh market; and then ſhe would furniſh a large quantity of ſeed. At worſt, the Iriſh can give up the making of very fine linens, and then they can raiſe a ſufficiency at home.

You think it probable that the *Dutch* will *with-hold* their ſeed, in order to advance their own manufactures; i. e. you wiſh the Dutch would join with you in diſtreſſing

diſtreſſing Ireland. What, I pray you, have the Iriſh done, that you are unwilling they ſhould get a ſupply of flax-ſeed ſufficient for their purpoſe, from any part of the world? What muſt they do to obtain your favour? Shall they *dethrone* the King, *kill* Lord North, and *blow up* the parliament?--- Will *this* ſatisfy you? May they, upon theſe terms, get a little ſeed from Holland?---I believe they need not ſolicit your permiſſion. You never yet knew a Hollander, who would with-hold any thing that would fetch him a good price.

Your malice againſt the Weſt-Indians is little inferior to that againſt the Iriſh. Give me leave, Sir, to tranſlate a paragraph in in your 19th Page, into plain Engliſh.--- The Weſt-Indians have no food but juſt from hand to mouth. Their lands are ſo valuable that they cannot afford to raiſe the neceſſaries of life: So rich, that nothing but ſugar-canes will grow upon them: Not a grain of Indian corn; not a yam, nor a plantain: Not a pig, nor a fowl, can live upon them:---They can get no ſupply from Canada: The Canadians are an indolent, lazy, ſtupid, popiſh pack; they mind nothing

thing but ſaying their prayers: The wheat they can ſpare, would not furniſh a dozen Weſt-Indians with bread: The Weſt-India Iſlands ſwarm with *ſouls:* An hundred at leaſt, to every two hundred acres of land: Theſe *ſouls* will devour an immenſe quantity of food: If the Canadians would turn good proteſtant republicans, join the Congreſs, and rebel againſt the King, in ten or fifteen years they might do ſomething;---" but in " the mean time the Weſt-Indians might " have the ſatisfaction of ſtarving:"---And to ſee them ſtarve, I preſume, would be a particular *ſatisfaction* to you.

But, as I love to diſappoint malice, I have the particular ſatisfaction of informing you, that 350,000 buſhels of wheat were exported from Quebec the laſt year; and that above 50,000 buſhels remained on hand, for want of ſhips to carry it off; and that the quantity raiſed this year, greatly exceeds that of the laſt.---This is a ſure indication of the indolence of the Canadians:---A manifeſt proof that they " have not improved their " country as they *ought* to have done."---They, it ſeems, have been *raiſing* wheat, when

when they *ought* to have been *raiſing rebellion*. ---Indolent, ſtupid puppies!

Now, Sir, I imagine, that 400,000 buſhels of wheat a year, would do ſomething towards ſupplying our Weſt-India iſlands with bread; and though it would be popiſh wheat, and probably not quite ſo good as that which the Weſt-Indians uſed to get from the proteſtant fields of Pennſylvania and New-York, yet probably they may be prevailed upon to eat a little of it, rather than give you the ſatisfaction of ſeeing them *ſtarve*.

I have alſo the pleaſure of informing you, that there is now more lumber annually ſhipped from Quebec, than from any colony on the continent. This, with what would come from the Miſſiſſippi, the Floridas, and what the Iſlands themſelves afford, would be more than ſufficient for all their purpoſes.---Horſes they cannot want, while Canada abounds in ſuch numbers.

Upon the whole then, I muſt abide by my firſt opinion, viz. that our ſchemes of non-importation, &c. will not diſtreſs England,

land, Ireland, or the Weſt-Indies, ſo far as to oblige them to join their clamours with ours, to get the acts we complain of repealed.

It has been ſeveral times objected againſt the preſent violent mode of proceeding in America, that it cuts off all proſpect of a peaceable accommodation with our mother-country. You get rid of this objection, by informing us, that the Congreſs " have " petitioned his Majeſty for the redreſs of " grievances."

Do you remember, Sir, how much pains you have taken, to prove that *petitioning* would do no good: That our petitions ever had been treated with contempt and neglect, even when preſented " in the moſt loyal " and reſpectful manner, in a legiſlative " capacity."---And yet now, after you have entered into the moſt hoſtile combinations againſt the Britiſh ſtate; endeavoured, by diſtreſſing and ſtarving the Iriſh and the Weſt-Indians, to make them take part in your rebellion; attempted to excite tumults and ſeditions in Great-Britain and Quebec, by inflammatory addreſſes to the people; diſavowed

diſavowed your dependence on, and ſubmiſſion to the authority of the ſupreme legiſlature of the nation,---you think a petition from an illegal, unknown Congreſs, which may probably do every thing you want to have done.---Under theſe circumſtances, to preſent a petition to his Majeſty, is offering a petition to him with one hand, while you hold a ſword to his breaſt with the other. And yet you aſk---" Can a " pretext be wanting, in this caſe, to pre- " ſerve the dignity of the parent ſtate, and " yet remove the complaints of the colo- " nies? How eaſy would it be to overlook " our particular agreements, and grant us " redreſs in conſequence of our petitions? " It is eaſy to perceive there would be no " difficulty in this reſpect."---If you have any modeſty left, hold down your head, Sir, and bluſh.

After this inſtance of your conſummate aſſurance, I can no longer wonder at your effrontery in calling it " the groſſeſt infa- " tuation of madneſs itſelf"---" frantic ex- " travagance"---ſhould Great-Britain attempt to ſupport her authority over the colonies by the ſword.

It has been the conſtant practice of your party, to preach up the improbability of Great-Britain's attempting to reduce the colonies to obedience by force. But ſuppoſe Great-Britain ſhould eſtimate the colonies as highly as you do, and ſhould conſider them as being abſolutely neceſſary to her very exiſtence, as an independent, flouriſhing ſtate. As ſoon as the proceedings of the Congreſs are known to her, ſhe muſt perceive that there is no way to bring the colonies back to their obedience, but force. Had a proper repreſentation been made;---and the proper perſons to have done this were our Aſſemblies,---the ſupreme authority of Great-Britain acknowledged; and upon that footing a repeal of the acts complained of ſolicited; Great-Britain, I doubt not, would have attended to us, and would have done what ſhe though juſt and reaſonable. She might have been induced to have made ſome conceſſions for peace-ſake, even though there had been ſome hectoring and bullying, and ſchemes of non-importation, &c. among the people. This was juſt the caſe in the time of the ſtamp-act, and yet the diſorders and confuſions, and non-importations of that period, never drew the reſentment

reſentment of the nation upon us. Is this the reaſon why you think it improbable that Great-Britain will now recur to force?--- Conſider the caſe is altered. The *grand* Congreſs, the *piddling* Committees through the continent, have *all* diſclaimed their ſubjection to the ſovereign authority of the empire: They deny the authority of Parliament to make any laws to bind them at all. They claim an abſolute independency.

Now what conceſſions can Great-Britain make, that would ſatisfy you and your party? She has it not in her power to make any—were ſhe even deſirous of doing it, and willing to ſacrifice her own honour and dignity, to gratify your humours. She has no choice but to declare the colonies independent ſtates, or to try the force of arms, in order to bring them to a ſenſe of their duty. This is the wretched ſtate to which your adored Congreſs have reduced us, and for which they deſerve the *curſe* of every inhabitant of America. No alternative is left us, but either to renounce *their* meaſures, or to plunge head-long into rebellion and civil war.

The true reaſon why the Congreſs did not petition the two Houſes of Parliament was, —I know it as well as if I had been one of the Delegates—becauſe they denied, and were determined to perſiſt in denying, the authority of the Parliament: And petitioning would be owning of it. You, Sir, gave a falſe reaſon. You cannot name an inſtance of any petition to either Houſe of Parliament from any legal body of men in America, ever having been "treated with "contempt or neglect;" unleſs you conſtrue "the not granting a petition, a con-"tempt of it."

You affect on every occaſion to diſplay "the omnipotency and all-ſufficiency" of thoſe colonies which have entered into *the* ſolemn league and covenant againſt Great-Britain. You mention the conſiderable numbers of their men—400,000, I think, your *Generaliſſio* rates them at—their valour, and bloody diſpoſition in the cauſe of liberty. I wiſh you had told us what reſources the colonies have, to pay, cloath, arm, feed theſe conſiderable numbers:—who are to levy the taxes neceſſary to defray the expence of theſe

theſe articles? Whether that is to be the buſineſs of the next congreſs.

On the other hand you always ſpeak of Great-Britain, as of ſome pitiful ſtate juſt ſinking into obſcurity.—You mention the ſmall number of her troops in America;—the decay of her commerce;—the decreaſe of her revenue;—her luxury,—national debt, &c.—the danger leſt the neighbouring ſtates ſhould all fall upon her, ſhould ſhe venture in a military way to ſend acroſs the Atlantic.—And then—"Ruin like a deluge, would pour,"—pour! a *deluge* pour!—A tea-pot can do as much as that—would *wheel*, and *boil*, and *foam*, and *thunder* "in from every quarter."

Do you think, Sir, that Great-Britain is like an old, wrinkled, withered, worn-out hag, whom every jackanapes that truants along the ſtreets may inſult with impunity? —You will find her a vigorous matron, juſt approaching a green old age; and with ſpirit and ſtrength ſufficient to chaſtiſe her undutiful and rebellious children. Your meaſures have as yet produced none of the effects you looked for: Great-Britain is not as yet intimidated: She has already a conſiderable fleet and army in America: More

ſhips

ſhips and troops are expected in the ſpring: Every appearance indicates a deſign in her to ſupport her claim with vigour. You may call it *infatuation, madneſs, frantic extravagance,* to hazard ſo ſmall a number of troops as ſhe can ſpare, againſt the thouſands of New England. Should the dreadful conteſt once begin—But God forbid! Save, heavenly Father! O ſave my country from perdition!

Conſider, Sir, is it right to riſk the valuable bleſſings of property, liberty and life, to the ſingle chance of war? Of the worſt kind of war—a civil war? a civil war founded on rebellion? Without ever attempting the peaceable mode of accommodation? Without ever aſking a redreſs of our complaints, from the only power on earth who can redreſs them? When diſputes happen between nations independent of each other, they firſt attempt to ſettle them by their ambaſſadors; they ſeldom run haſtily to war, till they have tried what can be done by treaty and mediation, I would make many more conceſſions to a parent, than were juſtly due to him, rather than engage with him in a duel. But we are ruſhing into a

war

war with our parent ſtate, without offering the leaſt conceſſion; without even deigning to propoſe an accommodation. You, Sir, have employed your pen, and exerted your abilities, in vindicating and recommending meaſures which you know muſt, if perſiſted in, have a direct tendency to produce and accelerate this dreadful event. The congreſs alſo foreſaw the horrid tragedy that muſt be acted in America, ſhould their meaſures be generally adopted, why elſe did they adviſe us—"to extend our "views to *mournful* events, and be in *all* "reſpects prepared for *every* contingency?"

May God forgive *them*, but may he confound *their* devices! and may he give *you* repentance and a better mind!

I come now, Sir, to conſider your addreſs to the farmers; and I very much ſuſpect that you wiſh I would take as little notice of it as poſſible. Indeed I ſhall not keep you much longer under correction, for I believe you are pretty ſore.

You begin your addreſs as though you was confoundedly afraid the farmer would not

not believe you. You judged right. They will ſcarce believe any thing you have ſaid to them, except, that you are no farmer: and *that* you had no need to have ſaid, your addreſs proclaims it. You make violent proteſtations of your love and regard to truth. You do right; the farmers elſe would have thought that you had no regard to truth at all. Almoſt every paragraph contains half a dozen fibs. Let me try the firſt, as it is moſt handy. You ſay, that you "love to ſpeak the truth:" *One*,—that you *ſcorn to* "*prejudice*" the farmers "in "favour of what you have to ſay:" *two*; "by taking upon you a fictitious charac-"ter:" *three*;—for you ſubſcribe yourſelf *a friend to America*:—that I am not in reality a "farmer:" *four*;—but "ſome "miniſterial emiſſary:" *five*;—"that has "aſſumed the name to deceive:" *ſix*;—the very next words contain another, but I will ſtop, or I ſhall betray my inability to enumerate more than nine figures.

You give me a hint about ſwearing: I have profited by it, and intend never to ſwear more. I wiſh you would take a hint about fibbing: It is rather a meaner quali-

ty

ty than that of rapping out a little now and then. What got into you to inſinuate that the people in England paid four ſhillings in the pound upon the value of their farms? —That they give a tenth part of the yearly products of their lands to the clergy?—— That they pay 10 s. ſterling per annum for every waggon wheel? A ſhilling or two for every pane of glaſs? and two or three ſhillings for every hearth? Did you expect that all this vile falſhood, and dirty miſrepreſentation, would paſs off without examination? If you know any thing about the matter, (and if you do not, you ſhould have ſaid nothing about it,) that the land tax in England is not laid upon the value of the eſtate, but upon the rent: and that the rent is now eſtimated as it was in King William's reign; ſo that though the tax is ſometimes *nominally* four ſhillings in the pound on the rent, yet it *really* is not half that ſum.—And if the people in England *give* a tenth part of the yearly product of their lands to the clergy, what is that to you? They, I ſuppoſe, may *give* without aſking your leave.—A tax is laid in England, upon wheel-carriages that are kept for pleaſure, ſuch as coaches, chariots, &c.

but no tax on farmers carts, waggons, &c. There is alſo a tax on window lights and hearths, becauſe that was thought the moſt equitable method of laying an even tax on houſes: but you know in your conſcience that it does not amount to any thing like the ſum you have mentioned.

Your next attempt is upon the imaginations of the farmers. You endeavour to fright them from obeying the parliament, by repreſenting to them the danger of having taxes laid upon their tables, and chairs, and platters, and diſhes, and knives and forks, and every thing elſe—and "even "every kiſs their daughters received from "their ſweet-hearts," and *that*, you ſay, would ſoon *ruin* them. No reflections, Sir, upon farmers daughters: they love kiſſing, 'tis true, and ſo did your mother, or you would ſcarce have made your appearance among us.

But I have a ſcheme worth all this table, and chair, and kiſs taxing. I thought of it laſt night, and I have a violent inclination to write to Lord North about it, by the very next packet. It pleaſes me huge-

ly, and I think, muſt pleaſe his Lordſhip, as it would infallibly enable him to pay the annual intereſt of the national debt, and I believe, to ſink principal and all in fourteen years. It is no more than a moderate tax of four-pence a hundred, upon all the fibs, falſhoods and miſrepreſentations of you and your party, in England and America.

You next endeavour to exculpate the town of Boſton with reſpect to the Eaſt-India company's tea that was deſtroyed there, and to throw an odium on the parliament for interfering in the matter. But on this ſubject you have my free conſent to declaim till you are weary. If we except the worſhippers of the Congreſs, the univerſal opinion is, that the deſtroying of the tea at Boſton, was a flagrant act of injuſtice, and deſerving of correction; and that the refuſal of the town to pay for it, is fooliſh and unjuſtifiable.

From Boſton you ſkip to Canada, and there open another battery againſt the parliament. In Canada, every thing is worſe than bad, as you ſay. French laws, popery,

arbitrary power, are all joined together by your magical pen, and form a moſt *Cerberian* appearance. But, Sir, I can read an act of parliament, at leaſt as well as you can; and I affirm, that the *Romiſh faith* is not eſtabliſhed in the province of Quebec. The Canadians are only indulged in that *exerciſe* of their religion which they ſtipulated for, when they ſurrendered their country to his Majeſty's General, the *church of England* is the eſtabliſhed religion; and a better proviſion is made for her, than in any other colony to the north of Maryland. The French laws are only to be in uſe till the inhabitants are better reconciled to the laws of England. Theſe laſt will be gradually introduced by their own legiſlature. Their own legiſlature have alſo the power of introducing trials by a jury, and the *habeas corpus* act, whenever they think they can be introduced with advantage *.

You ſay that "it is a falſe aſſertion, that "the merchants have imported more than "uſual this year." I have the very beſt

* A. W. begs leave to recommend a pamphlet, entitled, the Juſtice and Equity of the Quebec Bill, &c.

authority

authority to ſupport me in affirming, that they have imported this ſeaſon double the quantity that they did laſt autumn. I affirm alſo, that many of them would have imported more than they have done, could they have got credit: but their correſpondents were fearful of truſting their property in America under its preſent circumſtances. The merchants, Sir, have in a general way, imported *all* that they *could* import: and they will ſell, *all* that they *can* ſell: and they will get by their ſales, *all* that they *can* get. And had they not countenanced this non-importation ſcheme with a view to their own private gain, I would not have blamed them.

According to your opinion, the merchants and tradeſmen "are the people that would "be hurt moſt, by putting a ſtop to com-"merce." With regard to merchants, Sir, a non-importation once in ten years, would be highly beneficial to them. It would enable them to get rid of all their old moth-eaten, rat-eaten, worm-eaten, goods, at a high price, and would procure a quick ſale for the next importation.

But

But you encourage the farmers, and addreſs yourſelf to them in theſe ſmooth words of deceit---" Within eighteen months, the " goods we have among us will be con- " ſumed ;"---O how I ſhudder with the thoughts of the next winter !---" and then " the materials for making cloaths muſt be " had from you. Manufactures muſt be " promoted with vigour, and a *high price* " will be given for your wool, flax, and " hemp."---How, Sir ! I thought that the Congreſs had prohibited the aſking of a high price for home-made manufactures ; how then ſhall we get a *high price* for the materials of which thoſe manufactures are made ? But you go on, urging us to *kill* our ſheep *ſparingly* ;---" you can apply more of " your land," ſay you to us, " to raiſing " flax and hemp, and leſs of it to wheat, " rye," &c. And in direct oppoſition to the decree of the congreſs, you promiſe us " a great deal higher price" for theſe articles than uſual. But, Sir, we ſow already as much flax as we can conveniently manage. Beſides, flax will not ſucceed well on every piece of land : It requires a rich, free ſoil ; nor will the ſame ground, in this country, produce flax a ſecond time, till after an interval

interval of five or ſix years.——If the meaſures of the congreſs ſhould be carried into full effect, I confeſs we may, in a year or two, want a large quantity of hemp for the uſe of the executioner. But I fear we muſt import it. It exhauſts the ſoil too much to be cultivated in the old ſettled parts of the province.

You alſo endeavour to perſuade us, that the price of proviſions will riſe, as ſoon as the exportation ceaſes:—This may be *good logic*, as you great ſcholars call it, but it is horridly *bad reaſoning*. The price of proviſions is ſinking already. Our pork this year will not pay for the Indian corn conſumed in the fattening of it; and when all navigation is at an end, it will fetch ſtill leſs. But probably the Congreſs intended to keep the proviſions in the country, to feed that ſame army of 400,000 men, who are to fight the King's troops.

You give us the ſecurity of your word that "no violence can, or will be uſed to "ſhut up the courts of juſtice."——You are a man of great conſequence, Sir! lately dubbed

dubbed a committee-man, I preſume, from the airs of importance you give yourſelf. But let us ſee how the matter is to be managed.——" If the next congreſs ſhould " think any regulations concerning the " courts of juſtice requiſite, THEY WILL " MAKE THEM; and proper perſons will " be appointed to carry them into execu- " tion, and to ſee, that no individual devi- " ates from them."——So, now the maſk is off; now the cloven foot is thruſt out into open light. In May next the grand American republic is to be *licked* into ſhape, and fitted to govern the colonies. The congreſs have already uſurped the authority of legiſlation over all the colonies: they diſpoſe of the militia, direct our commerce, levy taxes for the ſupport of the ſaints of Boſton, regulate our diverſions, direct what we ſhall eat, drink, wear, ſpeak and think; and in May next, are to take the management of the courts of juſtice.——You diſclaim the thought of erecting a commonwealth in America. Why, Sir, by your own account the affair will be completed in May next. *Then* our whole conſtitution is to be finally deſtroyed; our trials by juries taken away;

our

our courts of juſtice ſhut; our legiſlature rendered uſeleſs; our laws overturned;—— in order to make room for an American republic, on a true democratical plan: and then you will laugh at thoſe ſimple people, who believed you ever intended to do otherwiſe.

Now we are on this ſubject of a commonwealth, pray let me aſk you, whether you have never heard it whiſpered about, that it was ſeriouſly propoſed in the late congreſs, to throw off all connection with Great-Britain, and to erect two republics, one in the eaſtern, the other in the ſouthern colonies, or ſomething equivalent? Whether, when the New-York delegates oppoſed ſome violent meaſures, a gentleman from the eaſtward did not remark, that the backward conduct of the York delegates was eaſily accounted for, becauſe they knew that the old charter of Maſſachuſetts-Bay covered all this province? And whether ſome minutes of the proceedings of the congreſs were not cut out of the book, a little before they broke up? Let the gentlemen tell the *truth*, the *whole* truth, and *nothing* but the truth, and then we ſhall

know what we have to truſt to. Theſe are queſtions that I have a right to aſk; and the public has a right to be informed, whether there is any truth in the report that have occaſioned them.

A. W. FARMER.

December 24, 1774.

FINIS.